

## Inspection Report with SI&A Data

**Structure Description:**

**2 District:** 06      **3 County:** Pendleton      **16 Latitude:** 38°40'40.00"      **7 Longitude:** 84°19'41.00"  
**7 Facility Carried:** KY-22      **Milepoint:** 11.430  
**6A Feature Intersected:** LICKING RIVER  
**9 Location:** 1.1 MI EAST JCT US-27

NBI	X
Element	X
Fracture Critical	
Underwater	
Special	

NBI CONDITION RATINGS	
<b>58 Deck:</b> 8	<b>61 Channel:</b> 7
<b>59 Superstructure:</b> 8	<b>62 Culvert:</b> N
<b>60 Substructure:</b> 8	<b>Sufficiency Rating:</b> 90.5

GEOMETRIC DATA	
<b>48 Max Length Span:</b>	207.590 ft
<b>49 Structure Length:</b>	747.090 ft
<b>32 Approach Roadway:</b>	28.020 ft
<b>33 Median:</b>	(0) No Median
<b>34 Skew:</b>	0°
<b>35 Flare:</b>	No Flare
<b>50A Curb/Sidewalk Width L:</b>	4.760 ft
<b>50B Curb/Sidewalk Width R:</b>	4.760 ft
<b>47 Horiz. Clearance:</b>	28.020 ft
<b>51 Width Curb to Curb:</b>	28.020 ft
<b>52 Width Out to Out:</b>	40.280 ft

DESIGN	
<b>Substandard:</b>	No
<b>Fracture Critical:</b>	No FC Details
<b>43A Main Span Material:</b>	(4) Steel Continuous
<b>43B Main Span Design:</b>	(02) Stringer / Girder
<b>45 Number of Spans Main:</b>	4
<b>44A Approach Span Material:</b>	Not Applicable
<b>44B Approach Span Design:</b>	Not Applicable
<b>46 Number of Approach Spans:</b>	0
<b>107 Deck Type:</b>	(1) Concrete-Cast-in-Place
<b>108A Wearing Surface:</b>	(1) Monolithic Concrete
<b>108B Membrane:</b>	(0) None
<b>108C Deck Protection:</b>	(1) Epoxy Coated Reinforcing
<b>Overlay Y/N:</b>	No
<b>Overlay Type:</b>	None
<b>Overlay Thickness:</b>	-1.000 in
<b>Overlay Date:</b>	

ADMINISTRATIVE	
<b>27 Year Built:</b>	2012
<b>106 Year Reconstructed:</b>	0
<b>42A Type of Service On:</b>	(5) Hyw - Ped
<b>42B Type of Service Under:</b>	(5) Waterway
<b>37 Historical Significance:</b>	(5) Not Eligible
<b>21 Maintenance Responsibility:</b>	(01) State Hwy Agency
<b>22 Owner:</b>	(01) State Hwy Agency
<b>101 Parallel Structure:</b>	(N) No II Structure Exists

APPRAISAL	
<b>36A Bridge Railings:</b>	(1) Meets Standards
<b>36B Transitions:</b>	(1) Meets Standards
<b>36C Approach Guardrail:</b>	(1) Meets Standards
<b>36D Approach Guardrail Ends:</b>	(1) Meets Standards
<b>71 Waterway Adequacy:</b>	(9) Above Desirable
<b>72 Approach Alignment:</b>	(6) Equal Minimum Crit
<b>113 Scour Critical:</b>	(8) Stable above footing
<b>Recommended Scour Critical:</b>	(8) Stable above footing

CLEARANCES	
<b>10 Vert. Clearance:</b>	99.999 ft
<b>53 Min. Vert. Clearance Over:</b>	99.999 ft
<b>54A Vert. Under Reference:</b>	(N) Feature not hwy or RR
<b>54B Min. Vert. Underclearance:</b>	0.000 ft
<b>55A Lateral Under Reference:</b>	(N) Feature not hwy or RR
<b>55B Min. Lat. Underclearance R:</b>	0.000 ft
<b>56 Min. Lat. Underclearance L:</b>	0.000 ft

LOAD RATINGS	
<b>63 Operating Type:</b>	(1) Load Factor (LF)
<b>64 Operating Rating:</b>	75.0 tons
<b>65 Inventory Type:</b>	(1) Load Factor (LF)
<b>66 Inventory Rating:</b>	45.0 tons
<b>Truck Capacity Type I:</b>	tons
<b>Truck Capacity Type II:</b>	tons
<b>Truck Capacity Type III:</b>	tons
<b>Truck Capacity Type IV:</b>	tons

POSTINGS	
<b>41 Posting Status:</b>	(A) Open, No Restriction
<b>Signs Posted Cardinal:</b>	No
<b>Signs Posted Non-Cardinal:</b>	No
<b>Field Postings Gross:</b>	-1 tons
<b>Field Postings Type I:</b>	-1 tons
<b>Field Postings Type II:</b>	-1 tons
<b>Field Postings Type III:</b>	-1 tons
<b>Field Postings Type IV:</b>	-1 tons

## Inspection Report with SI&A Data

12: Re Concrete Deck									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
SQ.FT	30,092.78	30,092.78	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<p>Deck*</p> <p>Note that minor transverse cracking was found randomly in the deck surface.</p> <p>Note that cold joints were found to be at random throughout the deck surface area.</p> <p>A moderate amount of dirt and debris buildup was found throughout the deck surface gutter lines.</p> <p>Note that bottom side of deck (soffit) could not be viewed for inspection, due to metal stay-in-place deck pan forms.</p> <p>Note that there was approximately an inch gap between the concrete of the deck and the asphalt of both approaches.</p> <p>See Photos</p>									

520: Conc Re Prot Sys									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
SQ.FT	30,092.78	30,092.78	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

107: Steel Opn Girder/Beam									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	2,988.36	2,988.36	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<p>Steel Girders*</p> <p>Steel girder elements throughout structure that were viewed from ground level appear to be performing as design at this time.</p> <p>Note that sometime in future inspections, due to height of structure, may want to consider an inspection with a under bridge crane in.snooper in. to get a closer view of superstructure elements.</p> <p>Both the rear and forward most ends of the beams at abutment locations could not be seen, due to concrete encasement.</p> <p>Note that both exterior girder elements #1 and #4 were found to have a protective paint coating which is becoming faded and chalky.</p> <p>See Photos</p>									

515: Steel Protective Coating									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	0.3	0.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

### Inspection Report with SI&A Data

**205: Re Conc Column**

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
EACH	6	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Columns\*

Note that all concrete columns were found to be performing as design.

**210: Re Conc Pier Wall**

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	57.3	57.3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier Wall\*

Note that all concrete pier walls were found to be performing as design at this time.

**215: Re Conc Abutment**

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	157.84	157.84	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Abutments\*

Both the rear and forward abutment elements were found to be performing as design at this time.

The forward abutment element was found to have graffiti along the left side of the abutment.

See Photos

**234: Re Conc Pier Cap**

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	114.96	114.96	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Pier Cap\*

Pier caps throughout structure were found to have rust staining typical throughout, due to weathered steel, otherwise performing as design.

### Inspection Report with SI&A Data

**310: Elastomeric Bearing**

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
EACH	20	20	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

Bearing Devices\*  
 Bearing devices throughout this structure are of elastomeric bearing pad design.  
 Note that only the front exterior face of the bearing pads could be seen at both the rear and forward abutments, due to concrete diaphragm design.  
 Elastomeric bearing pads at pier locations could only be viewed at ground level. Note that only exterior faces could be seen at this time, due to design.  
 All bearing pads devices appear to be performing as design at this time.  
 See Photos

**331: Re Conc Bridge Railing**

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
FT	1,494.18	1,474.18	99%	20	1%	0	0%	0	0%

Bridge Railing\*  
 Concrete bridge railing was found to be on both left and right sides of the structure.  
 Vertical flexure cracking with efflorescence was found randomly spaced throughout both concrete railings.  
 Cracking conditions was found at the right forward most end of the railing at the approach guardrail transition to the structure.  
 Area should be watched in future inspections.  
 Anchor bolts for utility lighting were found to be anchored into the topside of both railings, which lighting system was found not to be attached at this time.  
 Note that since last one on each side USGS box was found to be mounted to the top of both the bridge railings and to be hanging over the exterior sides of the railing.  
 See Photos

**804: Sidewalk**

Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(LF)	1,494.18	1,474.18	99%	20	1%	0	0%	0	0%

Sidewalks\*  
 Pedestrian sidewalks were found on both left and right sides of the structure.  
 Both sidewalks were found to have transverse cracking conditions in both, which the right sidewalk was found to be worse at this time.  
 A moderate amount of dirt and debris was found throughout the surface of the sidewalks.  
 See Photos

### Inspection Report with SI&A Data

850: 2nd Elem									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
<p>2nd Element Dist*</p> <p>Note that steel diaphragms throughout structure were found to be performing as design.</p> <p>See Photos</p>									

851: Transitions									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
<p>Transition*</p> <p>Note that that there was approximately an inch gap between the concrete of the deck and the asphalt of both approaches.</p> <p>See Photos</p>									

852: Drains									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
<p>Drains*</p> <p>Drains were cast through the deck surface along the right side of the structure only. Random drains throughout were found to be clogged at this time, which debris needs to be removed.</p> <p>May want to consider placing erosion control system along bottom side under spans where outlet of drains pour out. It has caused eroding conditions along bottom side of structure.</p> <p>See Photos</p>									

853: Utilities									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
<p>Utilities*</p> <p>Anchor bolts for utility lighting were found to be anchored into the topside of both railings, which lighting system was found not to be attached at this time.</p> <p>Note that since last one on each side USGS box was found to be mounted to the top of both the bridge railings and to be hanging over the exterior sides of the railing.</p> <p>See Photos</p>									

## Inspection Report with SI&A Data

857: Embankment Erosion									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Embankment Erosion* Eroding conditions was found along the embankment slope of the rear abutment. Note erosion control protection system should be placed as soon as possible to prevent further damage. See Photos									

860: Erosion Ctrl/Prt									
Units	Total Qty	Qty. St. 1	% in 1	Qty. St. 2	% in 2	Qty. St. 3	% in 3	Qty. St. 4	% in 4
(EA)	1	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Erosion Control* Erosion control protection system was found along the face of the forward abutment embankment slope as well as channel lining under span #4. Protection system was found to be performing as design at this time. See Photos									

STRUCTURE NOTES
*Structure Replaced 096B00007N  *Structure Stamped 2011 Plan # 25955

INSPECTION NOTES

WORK		
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; padding: 2px;">Action:</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">-</td> </tr> </table>	Action:	-
Action:	-	